

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGEForm Approved
OMB No. 0704-0188

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503.

PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.

1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY)		2. REPORT TYPE Conference Proceeding		3. DATES COVERED 20-24 October 2003	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE A Comparison of Biotic and Inorganic Sulfide Films				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER 601153N	
6. AUTHOR(S) J. S. Lee, R. I. Ray and B. J. Little				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Naval Research Laboratory Oceanography Division Stennis Space Center, MS 39529-5004				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER NRL/PP/7303/03/0054	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Office of Naval Research 800 N. Quincy St. Arlington, VA 22217-5660				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S) ONR	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT Distribution, tenacity and chemical composition of sulfide films produced by bacteria within biofilms were compared with those produced by waterborne inorganic sulfides. Attempts were made to differentiate corrosion mechanisms of alloy 400 (70Ni-30Cu) exposed to seawater in the presence or absence of sulfate-reducing bacteria (SRB). Experiments were conducted in an anaerobic environment in the presence of inorganic sulfide and SRB either freely corroding or coupled to an external cathode (alloy 400) exposed in aerobic media. Sulfur concentration in corrosion products increased in the presence of SRB and/or an external cathode. Bacteria encrusted with corrosion products and integrated into the sulfide film were only observed in the presence of SRB.					
15. SUBJECT TERMS microbiologically influenced corrosion, nickel-copper alloys, sulfate reducing bacteria, sulfide attack					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT	b. ABSTRACT	c. THIS PAGE			Jason Lee
Unclassified	Unclassified	Unclassified	SAR	5	19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (Include area code) 228-688-5494

20031217 269

PUBLICATION OR PRESENTATION RELEASE REQUEST

Pubkey: 3672

NRLINST 5600.2

REFERENCES AND ENCLOSURES	2. TYPE OF PUBLICATION OR PRESENTATION	3. ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION
Ref: (a) NRL Instruction 5600.2 (b) NRL Instruction 5510.40D	<input type="checkbox"/> Abstract only, published <input type="checkbox"/> Book <input type="checkbox"/> Conference Proceedings (refereed) <input type="checkbox"/> Invited speaker <input type="checkbox"/> Journal article (refereed) <input type="checkbox"/> Oral Presentation, published <input type="checkbox"/> Other, explain	<input type="checkbox"/> Abstract only, not published <input type="checkbox"/> Book chapter <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Conference Proceedings (not refereed) <input type="checkbox"/> Multimedia report <input type="checkbox"/> Journal article (not refereed) <input type="checkbox"/> Oral Presentation, not published
Encl: (1) Two copies of subject paper (or abstract)		STRN <u>NRL/PP/7303-03-54</u> Route Sheet No. <u>7303/</u> Job Order No. <u>73-5052-13-5</u> Classification <u>X</u> U <u> </u> C Sponsor <u>ONR BASE</u> approval obtained <u>X</u> yes <u> </u> no

4. AUTHOR

Title of Paper or Presentation

A Comparison of Biotic and Inorganic Sulfide Films

Author(s) Name(s) (First, MI, Last), Code, Affiliation if not NRL

Jason S. Lee, Richard I. Ray, Brenda J. Little

It is intended to offer this paper to the LATINCORR 2003

(Name of Conference)

20-OCT - 24-OCT-2003, Santiago, Chile, Unclassified

(Date, Place and Classification of Conference)

and/or for publication in LATINCORR 2003, Unclassified

(Name and Classification of Publication)

(Name of Publisher)

After presentation or publication, pertinent publication/presentation data will be entered in the publications data base, in accordance with reference (a).

It is the opinion of the author that the subject paper (is) (is not X) classified, in accordance with reference (b).This paper does not violate any disclosure of trade secrets or suggestions of outside individuals or concerns which have been communicated to the Laboratory in confidence. This paper (does) (does not X) contain any militarily critical technology. This subject paper (has) (has never X) been incorporated in an official NRL Report.

Jason S. Lee, 7330

Name and Code (Principal Author)

(Signature)

5. ROUTING/APPROVAL			
CODE	SIGNATURE	DATE	COMMENTS
Author(s) Lee		6/2/03	
Section Head			
Branch Head N/A			
Division Head Little			
Payne, acting		6/5/03	1. Release of this paper is approved. 2. To the best knowledge of this Division, the subject matter of this paper (has <u> </u>) (has never <u>X</u>) been classified.
Security, Code 7030.1		6/6/03	1. Paper or abstract was released. 2. A copy is filed in this office.
Office of Counsel, Code 1008.3		6/23/03	055C-2173
ADOR/Director NCST E.O. Hartwig, 7000			
Public Affairs (Unclassified/ Unlimited Only), Code 7030.4		6/17/03	
Division, Code			
Author, Code			

6. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENTS (Author to check appropriate statement and fill reason as required)

☒ **A - Approved for public release, distribution is unlimited.**

☐ **B - Distribution authorized to U.S. Government agencies only (check reason below):**

- | | | |
|---|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Foreign Government Information | <input type="checkbox"/> Contractor Performance Evaluation | <input type="checkbox"/> Critical Technology |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Proprietary Information | <input type="checkbox"/> Administrative/Operational Use | <input type="checkbox"/> Premature Dissemination |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Test and Evaluation | <input type="checkbox"/> Software Documentation | <input type="checkbox"/> Cite "Specific Authority" _____
(Identification of valid documented authority) |
- Date statement applied _____
- Other requests for this document shall be referred to _____
(Insert Controlling DOD Office*)

☐ **C - Distribution authorized to U.S. Government agencies and their contractors (check reason below):**

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Foreign Government Information | <input type="checkbox"/> Software Documentation | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Administrative/Operational Use | <input type="checkbox"/> Critical Technology | <input type="checkbox"/> Cite "Specific Authority" _____
(Identification of valid documented authority) |
- Date statement applied _____
- Other requests for this document shall be referred to _____
(Insert Controlling DOD Office*)

☐ **D - Distribution authorized to DOD and DOD contractors only (check reason below):**

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Foreign Government Information | <input type="checkbox"/> Critical Technology |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Software Documentation | <input type="checkbox"/> Cite "Specific Authority" _____
(Identification of valid documented authority) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Administrative/Operational Use | |
- Date statement applied _____
- Other requests for this document shall be referred to _____
(Insert Controlling DOD Office*)

☐ **E - Distribution authorized to DOD components only (check reason below):**

- | | | |
|---|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Proprietary Information | <input type="checkbox"/> Premature Dissemination | <input type="checkbox"/> Critical Technology |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Foreign Government Information | <input type="checkbox"/> Software Documentation | <input type="checkbox"/> Direct Military Support |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Administrative/Operational Use | <input type="checkbox"/> Contractor Performance Evaluation | <input type="checkbox"/> Test and Evaluation |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Cite "Specific Authority" _____
(Identification of valid documented authority) |
- Date statement applied _____
- Other requests for this document shall be referred to _____
(Insert Controlling DOD Office*)

☐ **F - Further dissemination only as directed by _____**

(Insert Controlling DOD Office*)

Date statement applied _____ or higher DOD authority _____

☐ **G - Distribution authorized to U.S. Government agencies and private individuals or enterprises eligible to obtain export-controlled technical data in accordance with regulations implementing 10 U.S.C. 140c.**

Date statement applied _____

Other requests for this document shall be referred to _____
(Insert Controlling DOD Office*)

*For NRL publications, this is usually the Commanding Officer, Naval Research Laboratory, Washington, DC 20375-5320

7. OTHER LIMITATION

☐ Classification ☐ NOFORN ☐ DTIC exempt (explain) _____

Classification Review
(Initial/Date)

Substantive changes made in this document after approval by Classification Review and Public Release invalidate these reviews. Therefore, if any substantive changes are made by the author, Technical Information, or anyone else, the document must be returned for another Classification Review and Publication Release.

8. INSTRUCTIONS


Author completes and submits this form with the manuscript via line channels to the division head for review and approval according to the routing in Section 4.

1. NRL Reports.....Submit the diskette (if available), manuscript, typed double-spaced, complete with tables, illustrations, references, draft SF 298, and proposed distribution list.
2. NRL Memorandum Reports.....Submit a copy of the original, typed manuscript complete with tables, illustrations, references, draft SF 298, and proposed distribution list.
3. NRL Publications or other books, brochures, pamphlets,.....Handled on a per case basis by Site Technical Information Office. proceedings, or any other printed publications.

LATINCORR

2003

5to. Congreso de Corrosión de la NACE Región Latinoamérica
8vo. Congreso Iberoamericano de Corrosión y Protección



20 al 24 de Octubre
SANTIAGO • CHILE



Facultad de Química y Biología
Departamento de Química de los Materiales
Facultad de Ingeniería, Departamento de Metalurgia
Universidad de Santiago



Escuela de Construcción Civil
Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile



Instituto de Química
Universidad Católica de Valparaíso



GOBIERNO DE CHILE
CONICYT



Best Available Copy

A Comparison of Biotic and Inorganic Sulfide Films

J.S. Lee, R.I. Ray, and B.J. Little*

Naval Research Laboratory, Code 7303 / 7330, Stennis Space Center, MS 39529
blittle@nrlssc.navy.mil

ABSTRACT

Distribution, tenacity and chemical composition of sulfide films produced by bacteria within biofilms were compared with those produced by waterborne inorganic sulfides. Attempts were made to differentiate corrosion mechanisms of alloy 400 (70Ni-30Cu) exposed to seawater in the presence or absence of sulfate-reducing bacteria (SRB). Experiments were conducted in an anaerobic environment in the presence of inorganic sulfide and SRB either freely corroding or coupled to an external cathode (alloy 400) exposed in aerobic media. Sulfur concentration in corrosion products increased in the presence of SRB and/or an external cathode. Bacteria encrusted with corrosion products and integrated into the sulfide film were only observed in the presence of SRB.

Keywords: microbiologically influenced corrosion, nickel-copper alloys, sulfate reducing bacteria, sulfide attack

INTRODUCTION

Determination of specific mechanisms for corrosion due to microbiologically mediated oxidation and reduction of sulfur is complicated by (1) the variety of potential metabolic/energy sources and by-products, (2) the coexistence of reduced and oxidized sulfur species, (3) competing reactions with inorganic and organic compounds, and (4) the versatility and adaptability of microorganisms. The physical scale over which the sulfur cycle influences corrosion varies with environment. The complete sulfur cycle of oxidation and reduction reactions can take place in macro (bulk) environments, including sewers and polluted harbours or within the microenvironment of biofilms.

Most of the literature on sulfide induced corrosion of copper and nickel alloys does not differentiate between corrosion due to waterborne sulfides and sulfides produced by SRB within biofilms. The problem of accelerated corrosion of copper/nickel and nickel/copper alloys by waterborne sulfides was identified in the 1970s and early 1980s.¹⁻³ In most cases, investigators used laboratory experiments in which 90/10 or 70/30 copper/nickel alloys were exposed to artificial or natural seawater with sodium sulfide. Gudas and Hack⁴ demonstrated that inorganic sulfide films enhanced galvanic corrosion under some circumstances. Syrett⁵⁻⁷ demonstrated that deaerated seawater containing dissolved inorganic sulfides did not immediately lead to accelerated corrosion. However, exposure of a porous sulfide corrosion product to oxygen produced aggressive corrosion. Investigators now recognize that most failures of copper and nickel alloys in actual seawater service are related to *in situ* sulfide production by SRB in biofilms.

Nickel/copper alloy 400 (Monel 400), nominally containing 66.5% nickel, 31.5% copper and 1.25% iron, is used for seawater and brackish water handling because of its resistance to chloride-ion stress corrosion cracking and erosion corrosion. Friend⁸ established that nickel/copper alloys containing more than 30% nickel formed a passive film similar to that formed on pure nickel. Localized corrosion of alloy 400 in seawater service is related to stagnation and/or intermittent flow.^{9,10}

EXPERIMENTAL

Disk shaped alloy 400 coupons (1.58 cm diameter x 0.158 cm thick) were purchased with an as-mill finish (Metal Samples, Munford, Alabama, USA). Wire leads (100 cm long) were electrically attached to the back of the samples by carbon tape and silver adhesive. Samples were embedded in EpoThin epoxy (Buehler Ltd, Lake Bluff, IL, USA). The epoxy created a watertight seal at the connections. Samples were wet-polished to a 1200 grit finish, sonicated in acetone for 5 minutes, rinsed with ethanol, and dried with nitrogen gas.

The mixed SRB species inoculum has been described previously.¹⁰⁻¹² All isolates are positive for desulfoviridin (characteristic of *Desulfovibrio* sp.). 100-ml stock cultures of SRB were maintained in liquid growth medium (Postgate B)¹³ supplemented with NaCl (3% w/v). Cultures were kept in glass bottles fitted with rubber septa and aluminium crimped tops and were placed in glass canisters with an anaerobic gas generating system (BBL™ Gas Pak Plus™; Becton Dickinson Co., Sparks, MD) at 30 °C until use. Dissolved sulfide (S^{2-}) was determined by the methylene blue method¹⁴ using a Hach Model DR/2500 spectrophotometer (Hach Co., Loveland, CO).

Three 1.5 litre glass containers were filled with 1350 ml of artificial seawater (ASW) (35 ppt salinity, pH = 8.2). 150 ml of Postgate B medium was also added to make a suitable environment for bacterial growth. Containers were labelled 'SRB,' 'uninoculated,' and 'aerobic.' SRB and uninoculated containers were maintained in an anaerobic hood after purging for 15 minutes with nitrogen gas. Two alloy 400 samples in the vertical orientation were placed in each container (Figure 1). Three samples were similarly placed in the container containing aerobic media. A single saturated calomel reference electrode (SCE) was placed inside the anaerobic chamber in a beaker of saturated KCl solution. KCl salt bridges were used for continuous solution conductivity between containers. Each electrode was connected to a data logger that measured the corrosion potential vs. SCE every 10 minutes. No attempt was made to insure sterile conditions in the uninoculated control. The anaerobic chamber was maintained at 30 °C.




Figure 1. Schematic of the experimental set-up.

Dissolved sulfide in the SRB and uninoculated containers was maintained at the same concentration by adding Na_2S . One sample from each container in the anaerobic hood was electrically coupled (by wire) to a sample in the 'aerobic' container. After 40 hrs, bulk dissolved sulfide concentrations of the bulk solution were measured: 4.17 ppm for SRB, 0.57 ppm for uninoculated. 4 ppm Na_2S was added to uninoculated container for a final bulk concentration of 3.67 ppm sulfide. Sulfide concentrations were measured at $t = 68, 140, \text{ and } 184$ hrs. After 70 hrs the coupled anaerobic samples were disconnected from the aerobic samples and left to freely corrode. At $t = 184$ hrs, all samples were removed, rinsed through a series of ASW and distilled water dilutions to remove salts. Sample surfaces were examined using an environmental scanning electron microscope (ESEM), and corrosion products were characterized by energy dispersive spectroscopy (EDS).

RESULTS




Figure 2. Potential dependence and sulfide concentrations over the course of 184 hrs.

Figure 2 indicates potential vs. time over the 184 hr experimental duration. The non-coupled sample maintained in aerobic conditions (black curve) started at ~ -550 mV and rose to ~ -300 mV over the first 18 hours. For the duration of the experiment, potential values (black curve) ranged from -275 to -425 mV. The freely corroding (not coupled) SRB sample (blue curve) started at -600 mV, dropped to -650 mV in the first day and remained between -650 and -700 mV for the duration of the experiment. The freely corroding uninoculated sample (orange curve) started at -640 mV, rose to -570 mV over the first day, dropped to -650 mV when sulfide was added at $t = 40$ hrs, and remained stable until the end of the experiment. Both coupled samples, SRB (green curve) and uninoculated (pink curve) initially followed the potential rise of the aerobic sample (black curve) to -400 mV over the first 18 hours. At $t = 18$ hours the curves began to diverge, with the aerobic sample rising to -300 mV, the SRB sample curve dropping to -650 mV and the uninoculated sample dropping to -500 mV. At 40 hrs, the bulk dissolved sulfide concentration in the uninoculated case was increased to 3.67 ppm and potential dropped to -600 mV. Over the next 30 hrs, potential rose to -550 mV. At $t = 68$ hrs, bulk sulfide concentrations of the SRB and uninoculated cases were 4.17 and 2.58 ppm, respectively. At approximately 70 hrs, the couples were disconnected and both anaerobic sample potentials immediately decreased by 50 mV. Over the next 24 hrs, the uninoculated sample continued to drop to -650 mV at which time it followed the freely corroding uninoculated sample (orange curve) to the end of the experiment, ending with potential of -640 mV. The SRB sample also followed this trend freely corroding with a final potential = -660 mV. Final dissolved sulfide concentrations were 1.54 ppm (SRB) and 1.06 (uninoculated).

At the conclusion of the experiment SRB samples had very dark and uniform adherent surface deposits, with the coupled sample being the darkest. The uninoculated samples had patchy dark, non-tenacious surface deposits. In the SRB coupled case, the micrographs indicate that the surface was uniformly covered with sulfide corrosion products (Figure 3). In the uninoculated case, small patchy deposits were located on the surface. Microorganisms on the SRB sample were coated with sulfides while microorganisms on the uninoculated samples were not.




Figure 3. ESEM micrographs and corresponding EDS of surface deposits after 184 hrs.

EDS determined the SRB surface deposit to be composed of 16% sulfur, while the uninoculated deposits consisted of 9% sulfur. Similar differences were measured for uncoupled samples, 8% and 2%, respectively.

DISCUSSION

It is well established that alloy 400 is susceptible to SRB influenced corrosion.^{9, 15, 16} The process is as follows: as a result of anaerobic microbial respiration, SRB within a biofilm reduce the sulfate in seawater (2 gm L^{-1}) to sulfide. The sulfides react with the copper/nickel oxides to produce a sulfur-rich layer. Sulfide layers on alloy 400 form rapidly, causing acceleration in the corrosion rate during its formation. Maxwell¹⁷ and later Hamilton and Maxwell¹⁸ demonstrated the presence of SRB in anaerobic niches of biofilms developed in aerobic seawater. They surmised that upon exposure to oxygenated flowing seawater the sulfide layer would peel away in patches leaving bare metal exposed, thus creating an oxygen concentration cell which would provide new metal for corrosion attack. In this model, the aerated seawater supplies oxygen as a cathodic reactant to push the corrosion rate higher. However, this is often difficult to reproduce in the laboratory because of the unpredictability of sloughing, and the subsequent destruction of biofilm integrity. It was with this idea that the current authors designed this experiment in which cathodic current would be supplied remotely to a sample of alloy 400 exposed to dissolved sulfides produced by SRB. This experiment was designed to simulate the affect of oxygen on the corrosion behavior without removing the biofilm. Removal of the couple after 40 hrs (thus removing the remote cathodic current) was meant to

simulate the decrease in oxygen as a closed environment transforms from aerobic to anaerobic conditions.

Gouda *et al.*¹⁶ studied the electrochemical behaviour of copper-containing alloys in seawater exposed to sulfides and SRB. Using polarization resistance (R_p) and anodic polarization scans, they demonstrated that passivation of the metal surface occurred upon initial exposure of alloy 400 to an SRB environment. As seen in Figure 2, ennoblement of the coupled samples followed the rising potential of the aerobic sample over the first 18 hrs. While these data may indicate passivation of the alloy 400 surface, they more likely indicate the coupled samples were cathodically controlled over this time (by the aerobic electrode), corresponding with the build-up of dark surface deposits seen on both SRB and uninoculated surfaces in the first 18 hours. This process seems to be independent of SRB. However, at 18 hrs, differences are observed. The SRB potential drops from -440 mV down to -650 mV while the uninoculated potential drops from -410 mV only down to -500 mV. The difference in magnitude for the potential drops between SRB and uninoculated cases is possibly due to the formation of a patchy SRB biofilm which allowed the sulfide concentration at the metal/biofilm interface to increase, thereby, decreasing the potential. In contrast, the uninoculated case which did not contain intentionally introduced SRB, would not decrease in potential as much due to the lower sulfide concentration. Bulk sulfide concentration increasing over the first 40 hrs in the SRB case indicated the presence of growing SRB and the presence of a dark surface film indicates the incorporation of sulfide into the surface oxide. However, dissolved sulfide concentration in the uninoculated case declined steeply over the first 40 hrs indicating sulfide was not being produced. Throughout the experiment, the potential of the coupled SRB sample was always lower than the coupled uninoculated sample. This trend was also observed in the freely corroding samples.

Differences in sulfides produced by bacteria within biofilms and waterborne inorganic sulfides were identified. Sulfide layers formed in biofilms during exposure to SRB covered the entire surface of the sample. In contrast, exposure to uninoculated ASW and inorganic sulfides resulted in only localized sulfide deposits covering a fraction of the metal surface. Sulfide layers formed in biofilms were also more tenacious than those formed in the uninoculated case. The tenacity of the SRB sulfide layers may be due to the extracellular polymeric substances (EPS) produced within the SRB biofilm. EPS may act as an adhesive that thereby strengthens the sulfide layer against sloughing. Lee *et al.*¹⁹ found similar results in the corrosion of alloy 400 in the presence of SRB.

Chemical composition of sulfide layers produced by exposure to uninoculated and SRB containing seawater also differed. In the case of freely corroding samples, the SRB corrosion products had a high sulfur concentration of 8%, while uninoculated products were composed of only 2% sulfur. In the case of the coupled samples, the sulfur concentration increased to 16 and 9% for the SRB and uninoculated cases, respectively. The higher concentration of sulfur in the SRB containing media is probably due to the production of sulfides at the biofilm/metal interface. The higher concentration of sulfur due to coupling can be attributed to a combined affect of increased reactivity at the metal surface due to a driving cathodic current, increased activity of metal ions bound to SRB (see below) and the attraction of bacteria to the anodic electrode by electrostatic forces.²⁰ Sulfur concentration in the SRB layer is especially high considering the bulk solution had a sulfide concentration of ~4 ppm. These findings indicate a connection between bacterial activities and the resulting surface morphology. Active bacterial surface-mediated mineralization occurs either by the direct transformation of metals (i.e., methylation, redox reactions) or by the formation of metal-reactive by-products (i.e., sulfate reduction producing sulfide). Reduced iron and other metal ions are commonly precipitated on dissimilatory SRB cell surfaces as sulfides.²¹

Gouda *et al.*^{9,15} examined the susceptibility of alloy 400 towards microbial attack in Arabian Gulf seawater. Results indicated that SRB attack is initiated beneath black sulfur-rich deposits. The deposits were found to be mostly iron/nickel sulfides. No corrosion was detected after 3 weeks of exposure under anaerobic SRB conditions, but upon addition of aerated solution, the corrosion rate increased significantly.

CONCLUSIONS

Distribution, tenacity and chemical composition of sulfides produced by SRB within biofilms are different from those produced by waterborne inorganic sulfides. In an anaerobic environment, SRB within biofilms produce sulfides at the metal surface that lead to an increased sulfur in corrosion products. Coupling to an external cathode exposed to aerobic conditions increase the sulfur content further. Because bacteria enmeshed in biofilms produce extracellular polymeric materials the tenacity of sulfide layers produced by SRB may differ from those produced by inorganic reactions. In the experiments described, only the samples exposed to SRB had encrusted bacteria embedded within the sulfide layer.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors thank J. Jones-Meehan for supplying the bacterial samples and K.I. Lowe for the maintaining of the bacterial cultures. The work was performed under program element 0601153N, contribution number NRL/PP/7303/03/0054.

REFERENCES

1. J.F. North and M.J. Pryor. *Corros. Sci.*, 10, pp. 297-311 (1970).
2. K.D. Efrid. *Corrosion*, 31, 3, pp.77-83 (1975).
3. R.O. Lewis. *Mater. Perf.* 21, 9, pp.31-38 (1982).
4. J.P. Gudas and H.P. Hack. *Corrosion*, 35, 2, pp.67-73 (1979).
5. B.C. Syrett. *Corrosion Science*, 21, 3, pp. 187-209 (1981).
6. B.C. Syrett, D.D. MacDonald and S.S. Wing. *Corrosion*, 35, 9, pp.409-422 (1979).
7. B.C. Syrett. *Corrosion*, 33, 7, pp.257-262 (1977).
8. W.Z. Friend, ed., "Corrosion of Nickel and Nickel-Based Alloys," Houston, TX: NACE International, 1980.
9. V.K. Gouda, I.M. Banat, W.T. Riad and S. Mansour "Microbial-induced corrosion of Monel 400 in seawater," Paper no. 107, CORROSION / 90, NACE International, Houston, TX, 1990.
10. B.J. Little, P.A. Wagner, R.I. Ray and M.B. McNeil. *Mar. Technol. Soc. J.*, 24, 3, pp.10-17, 1991.
11. J. Jones-Meehan, K.L. Vasanth, R.K. Conrad, M. Fernandez, B.J. Little and R.I. Ray. In *Microbiologically Influenced Corrosion Testing*, ASTM STP 1232, Philadelphia, PA: American Society for Testing and Materials, 1994.
12. M. Walch and J. Jones-Meehan. Paper no. 112, CORROSION/90, NACE International, Houston, TX, 1990.
13. J.R. Postgate, ed., *The Sulfate Reducing Bacteria*; Cambridge University Press, New York, 1984.
14. L.S. Clesceri, A.E. Greenberg and A.D. Easton. Method 4550D, In *Standard Methods for the Examination of Water and Wastewater*; American Public Health Association, Washington, DC, 1998.
15. V.K. Gouda, I.M. Banat, W.T. Riad and S. Mansour. *Corrosion*, 49, 1, pp.63-73 (1993).
16. V.K. Gouda, H.M. Shalaby and I.M. Banat. *Corros. Sci.*, 35, 1-4, pp.683-691, 1993.
17. S. Maxwell, Ph.D. Dissertation, Department of Microbiology, University of Aberdeen, "Biological and corrosion activities of sulfate-reducing bacteria within natural biofilms," 1983.
18. W.A. Hamilton and S. Maxwell. "Biological and corrosion activities of sulfate reducing bacteria within natural biofilms," In *Biologically Induced Corrosion*, NACE International, Houston, TX 1985.
19. J.S. Lee, K.I. Lowe, R.I. Ray and B.J. Little. Paper no. 03214, CORROSION/2003, NACE International, 2003.
20. M.J. Franklin, D.C. White, B.J. Little, R.I. Ray and R.K. Pope. *Biofouling*, 15, 1-3, pp. 13-23, 2000.
21. G. Southam "Bacterial surface-mediated mineral formation," In *Environmental Microbe-Metal Interactions*, ASM Press, Washington, DC, 2000.